

LUKE'S USE OF THE JEWISH SCRIPTURES IN THE TEXT OF LUKE 24  
IN CODEX BEZAE

Jenny Read-Heimerdinger and Josep Rius-Camps.

The starting point for our study of the final chapter of Luke's Gospel is the name given to the village mentioned in Lk 24:13. In place of the familiar Emmaus, Codex Bezae has Οὐλαμμαοῦς, 'Oulammaous', which, in an earlier article,<sup>1</sup> has been identified as the place where Jacob had his dream of a ladder between heaven and earth and to which he gave a new name, 'Bethel' (Gen 28:19).<sup>2</sup> There are several parallels between the Jacob story and the story of the two disciples in Luke's Gospel. The main one, of course, is the encounter with the divine but there are others, too: notably, the setting sun, Jacob's sleep paralleled in the darkening of the disciples' eyes, and the awareness of the divine presence after initial unawareness. These points of similarity suggest that Luke's story is intended to be a kind of mirroring of the Genesis narrative which serves as a hermeneutical key for interpreting the theological significance of the Gospel account.<sup>3</sup> The motive for the disciples' journey is thus illuminated: like Jacob who was running away from his brother after tricking him, so the disciples can be seen to be fleeing after the betrayal of Jesus by members of their group. They need to escape from the sphere of the Jewish law, represented by Jerusalem, because the Messiah has been betrayed by his own people.

---

<sup>1</sup> J. Read-Heimerdinger, "Where is Emmaus? Clues in the Text of Luke 24 in Codex Bezae", in *Essays in New Testament Textual Criticism* (ed. D.C. Parker and D.G.K. Taylor; TextsS n.s. 3/1; Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 1999) 227-49.

<sup>2</sup> V. 19 of Gen 28 specifies that the Bethel was 'formerly (known as) Luz' which reads in Hebrew as (וּלַם לֹוּז) [ulam luz]. The LXX, instead of translating the phrase, curiously transcribes the phrase as if it were all part of the name of the place, οὐλαμλουζ [oulamlouz] (the μλ becoming μμ and the ζ softening to ς in certain LXX manuscripts, in line with common phonetic transformation). It is this transcription of Gen 28:19 that Codex Bezae uses to designate the destination of the disciples' journey in Luke 24.

<sup>3</sup> The parallels were examined in some detail in the previous article where it was seen that, according to the text of Codex Bezae, Luke already introduced an element from the Jacob story in the betrayal of Jesus described earlier in Luke 22. There, Judas' kiss is recorded with the exact words used in the LXX to describe Jacob's kiss of deception in Gen 27:27 // Luke 22:47D05.

The similarities between Jacob's meeting with God and the disciples' meeting with the resurrected Jesus are not just situated in the central section but they spill over into other sections of the chapter. We shall be looking more closely at the organization of the narrative in Luke 24 in this present study.

This use of Scripture to narrate an incident in terms of an ancient model is quite a different procedure from the appeal to the OT for proof texts such as came to characterize discussion of the Jewish background of Christianity in later generations. It is in line with the Jewish precept that all the history of Israel is contained in the Torah, and that everything that happens to Israel is a re-enactment of the original paradigm. Through the inclusion of key words and other subtle devices typical of Jewish methods of exegesis, the text of Codex Bezae in the final chapter of Luke's Gospel is closer to a Jewish interpretation of Scripture than is the text of the final chapter that is usually read, a finding that is in line with some studies of Codex Bezae already carried out with reference to the Book of Acts.<sup>4</sup>

If that is indeed the case, the traditional view that Codex Bezae transmits a secondary text produced by a later generation of anti-Judaic, Gentile Christians, will have to be revised.<sup>5</sup> With its perspective of Jesus and the disciples embedded as it is in the Jewish view of Israel, it is more likely to represent an early rather than a late text. Our thesis is that it may have been altered because later generations of readers did not understand the intricacies of the Jewish reading of the Scriptures or the

---

<sup>4</sup> See, for example, (Read-)Heimerdinger, 'The Seven Steps of Codex Bezae, A Prophetic Interpretation of Acts 12,' Codex Bezae. Studies from the Lunel Colloquium June 1994 (ed. D.C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux; NTTTS 22; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 303-10; 'Barnabas in Acts: A Study of his Role in the Text of Codex Bezae,' JSNT 72 (1998) 26-66.

<sup>5</sup> The view generally taken of Codex Bezae derives in part from the presentation of the MS by E. J. Epp. He argued in The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (Cambridge: CUP, 1966) that the text of Acts displays an anti-Judaic tendency, but he discussed only a small number of the variant readings of Codex Bezae and overlooked a great deal of evidence which shows that the inner perspective of the Bezan text is thoroughly Jewish. In other words, the tendency of the text may well be critical of that Judaism which does not accept Jesus as Messiah but this does not make it the work of Gentile revisers. Those who are best placed to challenge religious thinking are those who have first-hand experience of it, as the writings of the biblical prophets demonstrate.

subtlety of the exegetical methods employed. Alternatively, the alterations may have been a deliberate attempt to suppress what the Christian church came to perceive as excessively overt traces of the Jewish roots of Christian beginnings.

Even Westcott and Hort were prepared to accept that the 'Western' text of the end of Luke's Gospel was, exceptionally, more authentic than the Alexandrian text (AT) because it did not include certain material that was read by the major Alexandrian codices and that they judged to be later insertions. This is the material that they labeled 'Western non-interpolations'. Suppose that not just the omissions but the text itself as read by the manuscripts representing the 'Western' text were also the authentic text?

#### I. The Text of Luke 24:12-35 in Codex Bezae (D05) and in Codex Vaticanus (B03)

Our aim here will be to look at the variant readings of the two texts in detail. We will consider how the middle section of Luke 24 (vv. 12-35) is related to the first and the last sections, and we will extend the earlier analysis of the underlying difference in the purpose of the texts.

Only when the text of Codex Bezae is read as continuous text, and not as a series of disjointed variants, does it become clear that it has its own inner coherence. To facilitate such a reading of Luke 24:12-35, we set out on the following pages the Greek text of Codex Bezae (D05), the principal Greek representative of the 'Western' text, and, facing it, that of Codex Vaticanus (B03) as a representative of the AT. Variants which arise between B03 and the text of the other chief AT manuscript, Codex Sinaiticus (S01), will be pointed out in the course of the subsequent analysis.

The texts are set out according to their literary structure since in the Gospel of Luke, unlike Acts, Codex Bezae does not organise the text in sense-lines. Variant readings are identified and classified into categories as follows: material which is present in only one of the two texts is underlined; that which is present in both texts but in a different lexical or grammatical form is printed with a dotted underline; and finally, different word order is signalled by square brackets [...] around the affected

words. Orthographical differences which represent historical linguistic change are not indicated.

**TEXT TO BE INSERTED HERE ON FACING PAGES (D05 -B03), keeping the literary structure in parallel**

LUKE 24:12-35 <u>Codex Bezae D05</u>	LUKE 24 :12-35 <u>Codex Vaticanus B03</u>
12 (↑)	12' <u>Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἀναστὰς ἔδραμεν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει τὰ ὀθόνια μόνα, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς αὐτὸν θαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός.</u>
13↑ Ἦσαν <u>δὲ</u> δύο πορευόμενοι ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ εἰς κώμην ἀπέχουσαν σταδίους ἑξήκοντα ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ, <u>ὀνόματι Οὐλαμμαοῦς.</u>	13 <u>Καὶ ἰδοὺ</u> δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἦσαν πορευόμενοι εἰς κώμην ἀπέχουσαν σταδίους ἑξήκοντα ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ, <u>ἢ ὄνομα Ἑμμαοῦς,</u>
14↑ ὠμίλου <u>δὲ</u> πρὸς <u>ἑαυτοῦς</u> περὶ πάντων <τῶν> συμβεβηκότων τούτων.	14 <u>καὶ αὐτοὶ</u> ὠμίλου πρὸς <u>ἀλλήλους</u> περὶ πάντων τῶν συμβεβηκότων τούτων.
15Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ὀμιλεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ συζητεῖν ↑ <u>καὶ ὁ</u> Ἰησοῦς ἐγγίσας συνεπορεύετο αὐτοῖς.	15Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ὀμιλεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ συζητεῖν <u>αὐτοῦς</u> ↑ Ἰησοῦς ἐγγίσας συνεπορεύετο αὐτοῖς.
16(οἱ δὲ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν ἐκρατοῦντο τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι αὐτόν.)	16(οἱ δὲ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν ἐκρατοῦντο τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι αὐτόν.)
17 <u>ὁ</u> δὲ εἶπεν ↑ Τίνες οἱ λόγοι οὗτοι οὐς ἀντιβάλλετε πρὸς <u>ἑαυτοῦς</u> περιπατοῦντες ↑ σκυθρωποί;	17↑ εἶπεν δὲ <u>πρὸς αὐτούς</u> · Τίνες οἱ λόγοι οὗτοι οὐς ἀντιβάλλετε πρὸς <u>ἀλλήλους</u> περιπατοῦντες; <u>καὶ ἐστάθησαν</u> σκυθρωποί.
18ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἰς <u>ᾧ ὀνόματι</u> Κλεοπᾶς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν· Σὺ μόνος παροικεῖς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ↑ οὐκ ἔγνωσ τὰ γενόμενα ἐν αὐτῇ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις;	18ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἰς <u>ὀνόματι</u> Κλεοπᾶς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν· Σὺ μόνος παροικεῖς Ἱερουσαλήμ <u>καὶ</u> οὐκ ἔγνωσ τὰ γενόμενα ἐν αὐτῇ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις;
19 <u>ὁ</u> δὲ εἶπεν <u>αὐτῶ</u> · Ποῖα;	19↑ <u>καὶ</u> εἶπεν <u>αὐτοῖς</u> · Ποῖα;
↑ Τὰ περὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ <u>Ναζωραίου</u> , ὃς ἐγένετο ἀνὴρ προφήτης δυνατὸς ἐν <u>λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ ἐνώπιον</u> τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ	<u>οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῶ</u> · Τὰ περὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ <u>Ναζαρηνοῦ</u> , ὃς ἐγένετο ἀνὴρ προφήτης δυνατὸς ἐν <u>ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ</u>

παντός τοῦ λαοῦ, <sup>20</sup>ὡς τοῦτον ↑ παρέδωκαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες ἡμῶν εἰς κρίμα θανάτου καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν. <sup>21</sup>ἡμεῖς δὲ ἠλπίζομεν ὅτι αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ μέλλων λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραήλ· ἀλλὰ γε καὶ σὺν πᾶσιν τούτοις τρίτην ἡμέραν σήμερο>ν ἄγει ἀφ' οὗ ταῦτα γέγονεν. <sup>22</sup>ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναῖκες τινες ↑ ἐξέστησαν ἡμᾶς· γενόμεναι ὀρθριναὶ ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον <sup>23</sup>καὶ μὴ εὐροῦσαι τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ἦλθον λέγουσαι ↑ ὀπτασίαν ἀγγέλων ἑωρακένας, οἱ λέγουσιν αὐτὸν ζῆν. <sup>24</sup>καὶ ἀπῆλθόν τινες ἐκ τῶν σὺν ἡμῖν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον, καὶ εὗρον οὕτως ὡς εἶπον αἱ γυναῖκες, αὐτὸν δὲ οὐκ εἶδομεν.

<sup>25</sup>ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· ὦ ἀνόητοι καὶ βραδεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ ↑ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἷς ἐλάλησαν οἱ προφῆται· <sup>26</sup>ὅτι ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ.

<sup>27</sup>καὶ ἦν ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωσέως καὶ ↑ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν ἐρμηνεύειν αὐτοῖς ἐν ↑ ταῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ.

<sup>28</sup>καὶ ἤγγισαν εἰς τὴν κώμην οὗ ἐπορεύοντο, καὶ αὐτὸς προσεποιήσατο πορρωτέρω πορεύεσθαι.

<sup>29</sup>καὶ παρεβίασαντο αὐτὸν λέγοντες· Μείνον μεθ' ἡμῶν, ὅτι πρὸς ἑσπέραν ↑ κέκλικεν ↑ ἡ ἡμέρα. καὶ εἰσηλθεν ↑ μεῖναι μετ' αὐτῶν.

<sup>30</sup>Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ κατακλιθῆναι αὐτὸν ↑ λαβῶν ↑ ἄρτον ἠυλόγησεν καὶ ↑ προσεδίδου αὐτοῖς·

<sup>31</sup>λαβόντων δὲ αὐτῶν τὸν ἄρτον ἀπ' αὐτοῦ...ἠνοίχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν· καὶ αὐτὸς ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν.

ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ παντός τοῦ λαοῦ, <sup>20</sup>ὅπως τε παρέδωκαν αὐτόν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες ἡμῶν εἰς κρίμα θανάτου καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν. <sup>21</sup>ἡμεῖς δὲ ἠλπίζ<ο>μεν ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐστιν ὁ μέλλων λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραήλ· ἀλλὰ γε καὶ σὺν πᾶσιν τούτοις τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν ἄγει ἀφ' οὗ ταῦτα ἐγένετο. <sup>22</sup>ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναῖκες τινες ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξέστησαν ἡμᾶς· γεν<ό>μεναι ὀρθριναὶ ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον <sup>23</sup>καὶ μὴ εὐροῦσαι τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ἦλθαν λέγουσαι καὶ ὀπτασίαν ἀγγέλων ἑωρακένας, οἱ λέγουσιν αὐτὸν ζῆν. <sup>24</sup>καὶ ἀπῆλθόν τινες ↑ τῶν σὺν ἡμῖν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον, καὶ εὗρον οὕτως καθὼς αἱ γυναῖκες εἶπον, αὐτὸν δὲ οὐκ εἶδον.

<sup>25</sup>καὶ αὐτὸς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· ὦ ἀνόητοι καὶ βραδεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ τοῦ πιστεύειν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἷς ἐλάλησαν οἱ προφῆται· <sup>26</sup>οὐχί ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ;

<sup>27</sup>καὶ ↑ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν διερμηνεύσεν αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ ἐαυτοῦ.

<sup>28</sup>καὶ ἤγγικαν εἰς τὴν κώμην οὗ ἐπορεύοντο, καὶ αὐτὸς προσεποιήσατο πορρωτέρον πορεύεσθαι.

<sup>29</sup>καὶ παρεβίασαντο αὐτὸν λέγοντες· Μείνον μεθ' ἡμῶν, ὅτι πρὸς ἑσπέραν ἐστὶν καὶ κέκλικεν ἤδη ἡ ἡμέρα. καὶ εἰσηλθεν τοῦ μεῖναι σὺν αὐτοῖς.

<sup>30</sup>Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ κατακλιθῆναι αὐτὸν μετ' αὐτῶν λαβῶν τὸν ἄρτον εὐλόγησεν καὶ κλάσας...ἐπεδίδου αὐτοῖς·

<sup>31</sup>↑ αὐτῶν δὲ ↑ διηνοίχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ↑ καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν· καὶ αὐτὸς ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν.

<p><sup>32</sup>οἱ δὲ εἶπον πρὸς ἑαυτούς· Οὐχὶ ἡ καρδιά ἦν ἡμῶν <u>κεκαλυμμένη</u> ὡς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, ὡς <u>ἤνοιγεν</u> ἡμῖν τὰς γραφάς;</p> <p><sup>33</sup>καὶ ἀναστάντες <u>λυπούμενοι</u> αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ εὗρον ἠθροισμένους τοὺς ἕνδεκα καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς <sup>34</sup><u>λέγοντες</u> ὅτι ὄντως ἠγγέρθη ὁ κύριος καὶ ὤφθη Σίμωνι.</p> <p><sup>35</sup>καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐξηγοῦντο τὰ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ καὶ <u>ὅτι</u> ἐγνώσθη αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου.</p>	<p><sup>32</sup>↑ καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς <u>ἀλλήλους</u>· Οὐχὶ ἡ καρδιά ἡμῶν <u>καιομένη</u> ἦν ὡς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, ὡς <u>διήνοιγεν</u> ἡμῖν τὰς γραφάς;</p> <p><sup>33</sup>καὶ ἀναστάντες ↑ αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ εὗρον ἠθροισμένους τοὺς ἕνδεκα καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς, <sup>34</sup><u>λέγοντας</u> ὅτι ὄντως ἠγγέρθη ὁ κύριος καὶ ὤφθη Σίμωνι.</p> <p><sup>35</sup>καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐξηγοῦντο τὰ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ καὶ <u>ὡς</u> ἐγνώσθη αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου.</p>
--	---

## II. The Purpose of Luke 24

The final chapter of Luke's Gospel relates three episodes in which the resurrected Jesus appears to different groups of his disciples, a series of appearances which culminate in his final departure at the close of the book. The episodes are frequently treated as independent pericopes because of the changes in time, place and characters but, as has already been argued elsewhere,<sup>6</sup> in the Bezan version of the Gospel they represent instead three stages of a progressive revelation whereby Jesus makes himself known to an ever wider group of disciples and with increasing completeness. The three episodes are unified by underlying links of both time and place.

Considering first the factor of time, it should be noted that the resurrection appearances in Luke's Gospel account apparently take place within a single day. In contrast, in the corresponding account of the opening chapter of Acts they are spread over a period of forty days. Both durations are figurative, a means of expressing truths about the significance of the resurrection of the Messiah. From a rationalistic and literalistic point of view of history they are mutually contradictory, of course, but

<sup>6</sup> C.- B. Amphoux, 'Le chapitre 24 de Luc et l'origine de la tradition textuelle du Codex de Bèze (D.05 du NT)', Fil Neq 4 (1991) 22-49.

Luke is not simply concerned with history as a set of verifiable facts about events which involve human activity. His concern, demonstrated throughout the two volumes of his work, is to communicate a theological message about the events he relates. This he does largely by implicit means rather than by logical explanations, according to conventions with which his readers would be familiar. History in the context of first-century Judaism (the context of Jesus and of the first Christians) is not as much the chronology of events which take place in a specific locality on the earth as it is the unfolding of the plan of the God of Israel with respect to his people.<sup>7</sup> The happenings in the human world serve as a validation of Scripture, they are an enactment of divinely revealed truth. Time, as indeed space, has another dimension than that of earthly reality, the spiritual dimension. In Luke 24, a single day can be understood as uniting the resurrection appearances in a progressive revelation (and corresponding understanding) of the conformity of Jesus to the Messianic prophecies of the Scriptures. That this is indeed the impression conveyed by the text of D05 will be seen when we consider the variant readings.

The places referred to in Luke 24 likewise contribute to the theological message of the narrative. Despite the localised shifts in setting, the entire day is centred on Jerusalem, the religious capital of Israel where God dwelt in the Temple. The importance of the name of Oulammaous is that it, equally, has theological significance for Luke, initially as a place of flight and then as a place of meeting between the divine and the human. Among the gospel writers, Luke may be the one to make the most use of the technique of using names to convey his message, but in so doing he is drawing on a store of traditional devices.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> See R. G. Hall, Revealed Histories. Techniques for Ancient Jewish and Christian Historiography (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991) 171-208.

<sup>8</sup> Rather more study has been made of this device with respect to the Hebrew Bible than the NT. See for example, M. Garsiel, 'Puns upon Names as a Literary Device in I Kings 1-2', Biblica 72 (1991) 379-86; *ibid.*, 'Homiletic Name-Derivations as a Literary Device in the Gideon Narrative: Judges VI-VIII', Vetus Testamentum 43 (1993) 302-17; W. W. Hallo, 'Scurrilous Etymologies', Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish and Near Eastern Ritual, Law and Literature in Honor of J. Milgrom (ed. D. N. Freedman and A. Hurvitz; Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns,

We will see that the tendency of the AT is to eliminate, or to tone down, the theological message by removing many of the details by which it is expressed in the Bezan text. In comparison with the Bezan version, the AT flattens the text to give a straightforward narrative account such as is read today and apparently has been since a time soon after the composition of Acts, except in those places where an alternative form of text was known. The variants that display this historicizing tendency are evident in the text of Marcion in the middle of the second century and in the papyri and Alexandrian codices of the third and fourth centuries.

### III. The Disciples' Partial Comprehension

We shall begin by considering how the Bezan text conveys the idea that the understanding of the disciples in the central episode is incomplete, and that it is in the final episode that full comprehension of the resurrection will come. By means of a series of readings in Codex Bezae, some of them subtly nuanced, the disciples are seen to remain sad and uncomprehending when they arrive back at Jerusalem. In the AT, in contrast, the two disciples understand straightaway what Jesus has to tell them, and the episode in which Jesus appears to them is of the same nature as the other two episodes in the chapter, with no suggestion of a progression in understanding.<sup>9</sup>

At three places, the D05 text employs a simple verb to speak about the explanation or understanding of Scripture, where the AT reads its perfective compound (prefix δια-):

1) v. 27AT: 'beginning with Moses and from all the Prophets, he (Jesus) interpreted thoroughly (διερμήνευσεν) to them all the things concerning him in all the Scriptures'. The task was carried out exhaustively. **D05**: 'he was beginning with

---

1995) 767-776; H. Marks, 'Biblical Naming and Poetic Etymology', JBL 114 (1995) 21-42.

<sup>9</sup> It has been pointed out by B. J. Koet (Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts [SNTA 14; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989] 56-72) that the episode of Lk 24:13-35 is full of interpretation terminology of Jewish tradition, an indication that the concern of Luke in this passage is primarily to speak about the understanding of Scripture. In D05, the terminology noted by Koet is more precisely adapted to the specific circumstances of the episode.

Moses and all the Prophets to interpret (ἐρμηνύειν) to them the things concerning him in the Scriptures'. The task is started but not completed.

2) v. 31AT: their eyes were completely opened (διηνοίχθησαν), with the switch of attention from Jesus back to the disciples signalled at this point by the connective (δέ) and the marked position of the possessive (αὐτῶν).<sup>10</sup> D05: their eyes were opened (ἠνοίγησαν). The switch of attention to the disciples has already been achieved in the supplementary genitive absolute phrase which precedes this comment in D05, 'as they took the bread from him'; the focus of the sentence is on the link between the taking of the bread and the opening of their eyes, with 'their eyes' as the subject of the main verb which follows the genitive absolute.<sup>11</sup>

3) v. 32AT: he opened completely (διήνοιγεν) the Scriptures to us. D05: he opened (ἤνοιγεν) the Scriptures to us.

The picture of partial comprehension about the Messiahship of Jesus is reinforced in the D05 text by further details:

4) v. 32D05: the disciples reflect that while Jesus was explaining to them the Scriptures, their heart was 'in a state of being veiled' (ἦν... κεκαλυμμένη, periphrastic perfect) (AT: 'burning').<sup>12</sup> Their comment can be set against the complaint of Jesus in v.25D: they are slow of heart (βραδεῖς τῆ καρδίᾳ) with respect to (ἐπί) the prophets, which can mean that they were slow to understand as well as to accept. The AT limits their slowness to believing the prophets.

---

<sup>10</sup> S. H. Levinsohn, Textual Connections in Acts (SBL Monograph 31; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987) 86-9; cf. Discourse Features of New Testament Greek (Dallas: SIL, 1992) 32-3.

<sup>11</sup> Levinsohn, Discourse Features 177-8.

<sup>12</sup> The possibility has to be considered whether the significance of the AT term 'burning' might be derived from the Targum Neofiti text of Gen 28:10 where God is said to have advanced the hour of sunset, wanting to speak with Jacob in private because 'the "Word" was burning to speak with him'. This may be an indication that even in the non-Bezan text the Jewish traditions of the Jacob story were recognised as being behind the Lukan narrative.

5) v. 33**D05**: the disciples are, in consequence, very distressed (λυπούμενοι) as they make their way back to Jerusalem, a remark not included in the AT.<sup>13</sup> They have not yet understood that they will see Jesus again; while they may have grasped that they have seen the resurrected Jesus, they have not realized the ongoing nature of the resurrection.

6) v. 37: their incomplete understanding is reflected in the reaction of the larger group of disciples when Jesus appears in Jerusalem. They are not expecting to see him and are troubled and perplexed (cf. v. 38). **D05**: they are afraid (αὐτοὶ δὲ πτοηθέντες) and can only think that it is a ghost (φάντασμα). **AT**: the fear is not so pronounced (P<sup>75</sup> B: θροηθέντες; S: φοβηθέντες). Jesus announces his presence with a greeting (v. 36c = John 20:19,21,26) and they think that it is a spirit (πνεῦμα).

The disciples finally comprehend the nature of the resurrection and the meaning of the Scriptures by means of the revelations made in the course of the final episode.

1) v. 44**D**: Jesus takes up his instructions to the disciples earlier on the road, 'whilst I was with you' (ἐν ᾧ ἤμην σὺν ὑμῖν), which can refer to a time since his resurrection. The **AT**, on the other hand, has him refer to a time before his death, 'when I was still with you' (ἔτι ὦν σὺν ὑμῖν), echoing what was said to the two women at the empty tomb, ὅσα/ὡς ἐλάλφσεν ὑμῖν ἔτι ὦν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ (v. 6).

2) v. 45: he opens their understanding (τὸν νοῦν) completely (διήνοιξεν); before, he had described them as 'without understanding' (ἀνόητοι), v. 25.

3) v. 46: he takes up the complaints of the disciples on the road: that the Christ (highlighted in D05 by being placed before the verb)<sup>14</sup> had to suffer (cf. v. 20), and that the third day is precisely the day of the resurrection (cf. v. 21).

---

<sup>13</sup> The passive participle of λυπέω occurs at one other place in the NT, in the D05 text of Luke 2:48. When the parents of Jesus find him engaged in discussion with the teachers in the Temple, Codex Bezae has Mary say that she and Joseph were distressed (λυπούμενοι) as they searched for him.

<sup>14</sup> Placing the subject before the verb, is a way of drawing attention to it, see Levinsohn, Discourse Features 18, 83-5.

#### IV. Historicizing Modifications in the AT

The lack of nuances in the AT is an indication of the way in which this text treats the central episode of Luke 24 as simply one among several, rather than as part of a sequential development. The same tendency of the AT to regard the story as a series of facts to be related can be seen in a number of other features in the text of B03:

1) The absence of linguistic developmental markers: *καί* is read in place of *δέ* at vv. 14a; 19a; 25a; 32a (and at vv. 38a; 42a; 50b, in the following episode). It has been recognised by linguists for some time now that the choice between *καί* and *δέ* not merely a matter of scribal stylistic preference.<sup>15</sup> The effect in the AT is to produce a narrative which is less clearly articulated, and in which conversations and events are not structured in such a way as to build on each other.

2) The presence of *καὶ ἰδοὺ* which confers on the narrative a biblical tone but without contributing to the theological meaning: v. 13 (and v. 49).

3) A certain objectivity on the part of the narrator, whereas the narrator in the D05 text enters more closely into the subjective sphere of the participants of the story: a) with respect to activities of speaking (*ὁμιλέω, ἀντιβάλλω, λέγω*): *πρὸς ἀλλήλους*, 'to one another' (vv. 14,17,32: cf. Luke 2:15; 4:36; 6:11; 8:25; 20:14) for *πρὸς ἑαυτούς*, 'to each other' in D05 (cf. 20:5; 22:23); b) with respect to the disciples' attitude: *καὶ ἐστάθησαν σκυθρωποί* (v. 17) for *περιπατοῦντες σκυθρωποί* in D05; *καὶ ἀναστάντες* (v. 33) for *καὶ ἀναστάντες λυπούμενοι* in D05.

4) A marked focus on the person and words of Jesus as compared with those of the disciples: *καὶ αὐτὸς Ἰησοῦς* (v. 15) for *καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς*. in D05; *καὶ αὐτὸς εἶπεν* (v. 25) for *ὁ δὲ εἶπεν* in D05. This insistence on Jesus reflects the understanding of the AT that the chief purpose of the episode is to present the

---

<sup>15</sup> Levinsohn, Textual Connections 83-120, explains the significance of particles such as *καί* and *δέ*, and demonstrates that they are far from being the stylistic features they were previously thought to be.

miraculous presence of the resurrected Jesus and the conclusiveness of his interpretations of the Scriptures. The D05 text, in contrast, is more interested in the state of mind of the disciples than the actual facts of the appearance or the explanations of Jesus.

5) The inclusion of a number of narrative details, most of them paralleled in the Gospel of John (v. 12, cf. John 20:3-4,6,10; v. 36b, cf. John 20: 19,21,26; v. 40, cf. John 20:20; v. 52, cf. John 9:38 [?]), and one in the book of Acts (v. 51b, cf. Acts 1:11).

#### V. Implications of the parallel of Jacob's dream.

Now that we have examined the way in which the Bezan account presents the disciples' understanding of the resurrection as a developing awareness, we can return to look more closely at the Jacob story that lies behind Luke's narrative.

The links between Luke's account of Jesus' resurrection appearances and the dream which Jacob had at Bethel of a ladder between heaven and earth are not straightforward, one to one parallels but rather an intricate web of interwoven strands which work together to produce a global picture rather than a linear one.

In the New Testament Gospels generally, the patriarch Jacob is represented on the one hand by Jesus and on the other by the disciples. His representation by Jesus seems to derive in part from the tradition that Jacob is the beloved of God, whose face was said to be engraved on the throne of God: according to some Rabbinic exegesis of the Genesis passage, it is this image which the angels were ascending the ladder to view, alternating their ascent with downward movements to look at Jacob on earth.<sup>16</sup> In the Gospel of John, it is Jesus who applies the dream of Jacob to himself (John 1:51). In the Genesis story, Jacob leaves this place of communication between heaven and earth to go on a journey, praying that God will bring him back in peace to his

---

<sup>16</sup> Numbers Rabbah 4:1, commenting Is 43:1-4; cf. J.L. Kugel, In Potiphar's House, The Interpretative Life of Biblical Texts (Cambridge, Massachusetts/London: Harvard University Press, 1994) 113-9; J. Massonnet, 'Targum, Midrash et Nouveau Testament', Les Premières Traditions de la Bible (Histoire du Texte Biblique 2; Lausanne: Editions du Zèbre, 1996) 67-101, esp. pp. 88-9.

'father's house'. So Jesus, when he ascends to heaven, returns to his father. In addition to these similarities between Jacob and Jesus, Jacob represents Israel, indeed his name becomes 'Israel'; as the Messiah of Israel, Jesus, too, represents the people whom he leads. Again, just as Jacob had twelve sons who became the founders of the twelve tribes of Israel, so Jesus chose twelve apostles to rule over Israel under his kingship (Luke 22:30).

At the same time, the role of Jacob in the Genesis story is re-enacted by the disciples. They are initially heading for the place where God revealed himself in a dream to Jacob. On their way, they meet and talk with the resurrected Jesus; they hear the revelation of the divine plan in the Scriptures and realize who Jesus is as they eat with him at Bethel, where Jacob talked with God; they will later witness the ascension of Jesus to heaven (Luke 24:51, not D05; Acts 1:9-11). When Jacob had realized that God was in the place where he had slept, he set up a stone which was later seen to represent the foundation of the Temple, the place where God dwells on earth.<sup>17</sup> Jesus, in revealing himself through his act of sharing the bread, signals to the disciples a change in the mode of God's dwelling on earth: he dwells no longer in a building of stone but in fellowship among the brethren.

In the account of the development of the Church set out in the book of Acts, Luke will show that within the plan of God for his people there are further breaks with the patterns of relations and systems of belief formerly established among the Jews, held until then to be unchangeable. It is important to recognize, however, that at least in the Bezan text of Luke's writings these changes are presented from a position from within Judaism, from an insider point of view. They are not viewed from the standpoint of Christians who claim superiority to the Jews, or who express

---

<sup>17</sup> Jewish tradition has it that the place where Jacob had his dream was on Mount Moriah, where Abraham had earlier been sent by God to sacrifice Isaac. Mount Moriah was also assimilated with the location of the Temple, in Jerusalem (Ginzberg, Legends of the Jews, vol. V (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1937) 289, n. 130).

hostility towards them from a position outside Judaism.<sup>18</sup> The close familiarity with Jewish ways of thinking, demonstrated by the profuseness and the subtlety of the allusions to Jewish literary, cultural and religious traditions which run throughout the Lukan writings in Codex Bezae, is no artificial device crafted by a Gentile author but is rather the natural and spontaneous expression of a Jewish believer in Jesus who is writing about and for his own people. His attitude resembles more that of the Jewish Prophets than that of the second century Christian Fathers.

#### VI. Sixty stadia away from Jerusalem

We have seen that in comparison with the version of Codex Bezae, the AT presents a less nuanced account of the meeting between the disciples and Jesus. Its interest is more in the fact of the resurrection appearances than in the mental attitude of the disciples, and the encounter is related as a straightforward historical fact. The contrasting concerns of each text become even more apparent when each of the two names used for the village which was the destination of the disciples' journey is considered in association with the distance from Jerusalem given for each.

It is difficult to know for certain what present-day distance corresponds to the measurement mentioned by Luke.<sup>19</sup> Essentially two lengths could have been known to him, one amounting to about 185 metres (one eighth of a Roman mile) and the other to about 150 metres (one tenth of a Roman mile). According to the former measurement (commonly accepted in commentaries on this passage of Luke's

---

<sup>18</sup> Epp's interpretation (The Theological Tendency) of the heightened criticism of the Jews in Codex Bezae as the work of Christians who wished to demonstrate that their religion was superior to Judaism, is only half the truth. It does not take account of the Jewish viewpoint expressed through the Bezan text overall.

<sup>19</sup> The length of the stadium in antiquity varied according to geographical location, political authority and era. (It further varies according to the reference works consulted!) The entry for 'stadium' in Webster's New International Dictionary (London: Bell, 1927) gives the measurements of 185m for the Attic and the Roman stadium, 192.3m for the Olympic stadium, and 147.9m for the Asiatic stadium. According to the Dictionnaire Larousse du XIXe siècle (1875) 1044, different measurements were used at the time of the Greeks and the Romans, and in different parts of the Empires; the distance of 147.2m is given as that of the stadium in Greece under Roman rule.

Gospel), the disciples were travelling to a village 11 km from Jerusalem; and according to the latter, the village was just under 9 km away.

The difficulties in locating 'Emmaus' are well-known for there is no such place within 9-11 km of Jerusalem.<sup>20</sup> By the time of the 12th century, the place called 'El-qubeibeh', which is around 11 km to the NW of Jerusalem, had become known as 'Emmaus' but there is no reference to this place before the 12th century. Other suggestions have been put forward for the locality of the village. A place called 'Ammaous', referred to by Josephus (*Bellum Iudaicum* 7.217), known also as 'Colonia', is about 5.5 km west of Jerusalem, so it would fit the distance of 11 km if Luke were giving the length of the round trip and not that of the single journey.

Finally, Emmaus has been thought to be the village of 'Amwas, 32 km west of Jerusalem. This appears to the place referred to in 1 Macc 3:40, 57; 4:3 as the site of Judas Maccabee's defeat of Gorgias in 166 B.C. The distance does not correspond to 11 km but it could fit with the distance of 160 stadia (approximately 30km, taking the longer measurement of the stadium) found as a variant reading in Codex Sinaiticus. The reading of S01 suggests that the name of 'Emmaus' was understood to refer to the place already known from the account of the Maccabean wars and that the shorter distance (60 stadia) was modified by S01, or at some point before S01, in order to make the place fit the real distance of Emmaus (as 'Amwas) from Jerusalem. The name Emmaus, in other words, was clearly understood to set the scene for an encounter envisaged as a literal reality.

Now Bethel, which we have seen is indicated by the name 'Oulammaous', is known from passing remarks in the Onomasticon of Eusebius to have been near the twelfth milestone on the road from Jerusalem to Neapolis, so Bethel was approximately 12 Roman miles from Jerusalem. According to the shorter of the two measurements mentioned above (1 stadium = 150m), this matches the 17 -18 kilometres which the site thought to be Bethel lies from Jerusalem today (12 x 10 x

---

<sup>20</sup> For detailed discussion and further references, see I. H. Marshall, The Gospel of Luke, (NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster, 1978) 892-3.

150m).<sup>21</sup> Consequently, in terms of stadia, Eusebius' distance was equal to 120 stadia (12 Roman miles x 10). Clearly, these calculations do not match the 60 stadia quoted by Luke; in fact, they indicate a place that is exactly twice Luke's distance from Jerusalem.

The discrepancy is puzzling for it is clear that Luke attaches importance to the distance since he mentions it even before the name of the village. It seems to indicate that the number of stadia is symbolic rather than literal, a possibility that tends to be confirmed by the reading of the name 'Oulammaous', signifying a place of spiritual reality. It was suggested in the earlier article ('Where is Emmaus?', 241-2) that the significance of the distance is to be derived from Luke's parallel account of the resurrection in the second volume of his work where mention is made of the 'distance permitted to be travelled on the sabbath' (Ac 1:1 2). This is the journey that the apostles made after the ascension of Jesus when they returned to Jerusalem and to the authority of the Temple. The number '60' designates a distance 10 times that of the sabbath day regulation, and the multiple '10' can be interpreted as intensifying the distance to an extreme point of contrast. The association of this symbolic distance in Luke 24 with the metaphorical name of 'Oulammaous' is strongly evocative. It reinforces the picture of the two disciples who, like Jacob, were running away to a city of refuge after the betrayal of the Messiah by certain members of their circle, in order to escape from the stringency of the legal requirements of retribution and punishment under Jewish law.

---

<sup>21</sup> The questions of the distance of Bethel from Jerusalem and its modern-day location are discussed by J. Bimson and D. Livingston, 'Redating the Exodus', Biblical Archeological Review 13/5 (1987) 40-68, esp. pp. 46-51; cf. correspondence on the matter of the distance between A.F. Rainey and Livingston in BAR 14/5 (1988) 67-8; 15/1 (1989) 11. The distance of between Bethel and Jerusalem cited in the previous article as 90 stadia ('Where is Emmaus?', 241) has been revised in the light of the BAR discussion.

## VII. The Identity of Cleopas

Having considered the symbolic and metaphorical nature of Luke's account, we are now in a position to have a closer look at the two disciples who met Jesus during their journey. There are indications that Luke intends his audience to recognize the identity of at least one of them.

Adjacent to the variant name of the village in v. 13, there is another variant reading in D05 which reads ὀνόματι where the AT has ἡ ὄνομα. If we look ahead to v. 18, we see there the same pair of alternative readings with the name Cleopas, one of the two disciples, but this time it is D05 which has ῥ ὄνομα, and the AT which has ὀνόματι:

	<b>Codex Bezae</b>	<b>Alexandrian Text</b>
<b>v. 13</b>	εἰς κώμην ... ὀνόματι οὐλαμμοῦς	εἰς κώμην... ἡ ὄνομα ἐμμοῦς
<b>v. 18</b>	ἀποκριθεῖς... εἷς ῥ ὄνομα κλεοπᾶς	ἀποκριθεῖς ... εἷς ὀνόματι κλεοπᾶς

Luke's interest in names as a vehicle to convey his message is demonstrated by his application of a device typical of his narrative technique: he uses two synonymous expressions to which he attributes contrasting meanings or connotations by selecting one or the other on separate occasions.<sup>22</sup> In his Gospel and Acts, the more common expression to introduce the name of a place or of a person is ὀνόματι:

<u>Luke's Gospel</u> (in addition to the <i>vll</i> at 24:13,18)	<u>Acts</u>
ὀνόματι x 6 (no <i>vll</i> )	ὀνόματι x 20
ῥ ὄνομα x4 (3 of them in the infancy narrative) There are no variant readings outside ch. 24.	ῥ ὄνομα x 1 (13:6, non D)

<sup>22</sup> This device has been noticed by Josep Rius-Camps and is discussed with reference to Acts on repeated occasions in his Comentari als Fets dels Apòstols, vols I-III (Col.lectània St Pacia 43, 47, 54; Barcelona: Herder, 1992-2000). It is also discussed by D. Sylva ('Jerusalem and Hierosoloma in Luke-Acts', ZNW 74 [1983] 207-19), as a narrative technique known outside biblical writings.

The only occurrence of ᾠ ὄνομα at 13:6 in all the Greek MSS of Acts except D05 can help to elucidate the meaning which it carries. Paul and Barnabas are said to have found a magician, a Jewish false prophet by the name of BarJesus: ἄνδρα τινὰ μάγον ψευδοπροφήτην Ἰουδαῖον ᾠ ὄνομα Βαριησοῦ. At v. 8, his name is said to have the meaning of 'Elymas'. The introduction of this character into the narrative has a different wording in the text of Codex Bezae: ὀνόματι καλούμενον Βαριησοῦ.<sup>23</sup> Here it appears that 'Bar-Jesus' is a name by which he was known, it was not his real name. The mention of another proper name at v. 8 (with another variant reading in D05!) would confirm that Bar-Jesus was a sort of pseudonym which was given to him.

In other words, where ᾠ ὄνομα is used in Acts it prefaces a name which is not the character's real name; it carries the sense of 'let us call him...'. It would be interesting to investigate the question of pseudonyms in the four occurrences of the expression in the early part of the Gospel, but such an examination at this point would take us too far from our subject.<sup>24</sup> Restricting our study to Luke 24, therefore, we will test the conclusion reached by an analysis of ᾠ ὄνομα in Acts to the variant readings of vv. 13 and 18.

Let us take first the name of the place. 'Oulammaous' in D05 is a name rich in associations and reminiscences of another story, one concerning Jacob, but it is not simply a pseudonym for it corresponds to a known reality and, according to the metaphorical articulation of the story in the Bezan text, it is its real name. It is therefore introduced with ὀνόματι. However, if the name of 'Oulammaous' is not recognized, it may pose a puzzle, for there is no village of this name in the area around Jerusalem. Alternatively, it may perhaps be recognized as a key for the

---

<sup>23</sup> The phrase is found once elsewhere in Luke's writings at Lk 19:2, in introducing Zaccheus. Was that also some kind of nickname? Or was it used in order to protect his identity as chief tax collector? Cf. Luke 8:41, where Jairus, a leader of the synagogue, is introduced with ᾠ ὄνομα.

<sup>24</sup> The occurrences in Luke's Gospel of the relative phrase ᾠ/ἧ ὄνομα are at 1:26 (Nazareth; om D); 1:27 (Joseph); 2:25 (Simeon); 8:41 (Jairus).

interpretation of Luke's narrative but its Jewish associations may cause unease. Faced with either problem, it is easy to see how the name should be changed to make it correspond to a known place, Emmaus. Those responsible for the change, however, knowing that 'Emmaus' was not the name given in the original story but is a substitute name, preface it with ἡ ὄνομα: 'let us call it "Emmaus"'.

Moving on to the name of the person, Cleopas, at v. 18, we find there that the variant readings open up a new area for investigation. The AT appears to treat Cleopas as the real name of the disciple: ὀνόματι Κλεοπάς. This is a disciple of whom nothing is known except his name; and although Luke clearly attaches importance to names in his work, the significance of the name of this disciple never becomes apparent in the AT. The D05 text, in contrast, is more specific about the name: ὡ ὄνομα Κλεοπάς, 'let us call him Cleopas'. In other words, this is a clue to the fact that 'Cleopas' is a pseudonym which masks the true identity of the disciple.

Who, then, is Cleopas? There is a series of indications that he is, in fact, none other than Simon Peter. These indications are more numerous in the Bezan text.

1) v. 13: The two travellers are introduced as 'two of them', δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν (AT), or with the presentative phrase 'there were two walking from among them', ἦσαν δὲ δύο πορευόμενοι ἐξ αὐτῶν (D05). The last people mentioned of whom these are two, were the apostles (vv. 10-11). The implication is that these disciples themselves must have been apostles.

2) The text of D05 closely links the beginning of this central episode with the end of the previous one, for it does not include the information about Peter going to the tomb given in v. 12AT (which, like the end of v. 36AT and v. 40 AT, has a parallel in the Gospel of John, 20:3-4,6,10). Nor does it open the present section with the AT's phrase 'And behold!' (καὶ ἰδοὺ) which conveys a biblical tone but also heightens the break with the preceding episode.<sup>25</sup> The word order of the opening

---

<sup>25</sup> It is to be noted that the same phrase καὶ ἰδοὺ is omitted by the D05 text at precisely two of the four other places in the Gospel where a character is introduced with ὡ ὄνομα: 2:25 (Simeon) and 8:41 (Jairus).

sentence 24:13 in D05 is that of a presentative phrase, ἦσαν δὲ δύο πορευόμενοι ἔξ αὐτῶν, which closely links the pair to the previous incident.

3) Peter had personally denied Jesus (Luke 22:54-62) and this would be ample reason for his flight. Given Peter's place among the disciples, according to Luke, as well as his eagerness to understand and act upon the revelation of Jesus as Messiah (Luke 6:14; 9:20; 32-3; 12:41; 22:33), he is likely to have experienced an acute sense of failure and disappointment after the death of Jesus.

4) v. 19D: Jesus addresses Cleopas alone (αὐτῷ), and he alone answers, instead of the two disciples in the AT (οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ). This means that the speech is pronounced by Peter if he is indeed Cleopas, and we need to see if this possibility tallies with the rest of the narrative and, indeed, if the contents of the speech matches other speeches attributed by Luke to Peter. The following points 5 to 9 will consider these questions.

5) v. 24D: Cleopas explains to Jesus that 'some of us' went to the tomb after the women had returned, without specifying who it was, but he then slips into the first person when he says 'but we did not see him', οὐκ εἶδομεν. This corresponds to the information provided by v. 12AT, omitted by Codex Bezae (= John 20:3,4,6,10).

6) vv. 19-21: there are correspondances between Cleopas' presentation of Jesus and that of Peter in the book of Acts (2:22-3,36; 3:13-15; 4:5-12; 10:38-9), which are the more striking that such similarities do not exist with the speeches of any other apostle in Acts, including those of Paul:

- Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου (the AT reads Ναζαρηνοῦ): Acts 2:22b; 3:6; 4:10b; the equivalent of Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ, 10:38a.

- ἀνήρ προφήτης: Acts 2:22c; 10:38b.

- δυνατὸς ἐν λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ (the AT inverts the order): cf. Acts 2:22c; 4:10c,12; 10:38c. (The same order, but in the plural, is found in Stephen's speech, 7:22).

- ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ (the AT reads ἐναντίον as in Luke 1:6AT, where D05 also has ἐνώπιον): Acts 2:22d; 4:10a,19 (cf. Luke 11:53D!); 10:38d.

- ὡς τοῦτον παρέδωκαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες ἡμῶν: Acts 2:23 (D); 3:13,17; cf. 4:5-6.

- εἰς κρίμα θανάτου: Acts 3:13D (εἰς κρίσιν).

- καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν: Acts 2:(23),36; 3:15a; 4:10c; cf. 10:39.

7) v. 34D: When the two disciples return to Jerusalem, it is they who report (λέγοντες) that Jesus had appeared to Simon (that is, Peter), and not the 'Eleven and those with them' who had remained in Jerusalem, as the AT with λέγοντας at v. 34 would have it. In the D05 text, consequently, αὐτοὶ in v. 35 takes up the same subject as that of v. 34 (in exactly the same way as in v. 14 of the AT);<sup>26</sup> direct speech gives way to indirect, with an imperfect verb (ἐξηγοῦντο) expressing the idea of a lengthy exposition of the things which happened on the two disciples' journey. The final verb (ἐγνώσθη), like those of the direct speech (ἠγέρθη, ὤφθη), is introduced by οτι and is in the aorist. The subject is clearly maintained from the initial statement, that 'the Lord has risen and has appeared'. If, on the other hand, it is those in Jerusalem who announce the appearance of Jesus to Simon, it has to be said that nowhere does Luke record such an appearance. Furthermore, the declaration is made in a participial phrase in the accusative (λέγοντας) which is an unusually weak construction in Greek to carry such an important piece of information which is entirely new in the AT version of the story.

8) The fact that the disciples are, in fact, apostles (cf. 1) above) means that they belong to the group of the 'Eleven' whom they find back in Jerusalem. This is not a contradiction if it is remembered that Luke uses the term the 'Eleven', like the

---

<sup>26</sup> J. Nolland (Luke 18:35-24:53, Word Biblical Commentary 35c; Dallas, Texas: Word, 1993) speaks of the use of this pronoun in v. 14 as unstressed, and as a typically Lukan formula.

'Twelve', as a label to designate 'the apostolic group' as well as to indicate the precise number of people within that group.<sup>27</sup>

9) There is a certain closeness of the Aramaic name of Peter, Cephas, to Cleopas. This lexical similarity in itself is not, of course, sufficient reason to assimilate the two names, but we have seen that there are other reasons for doing so. The meaning of the name 'Cephas' may, in fact have some bearing on the matter. Cephas means 'stone' in Aramaic as does  $\pi\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha$  in Greek. In the Genesis story, Jacob took the stone on which he had placed his head to sleep and, having poured oil over it, set it up as a pillar to mark the place where he had had his dream and where God was present (Gen 28:11,18,22). Jacob declared, 'This stone which I have set up for a pillar, shall be God's house' (v. 22).

In both the targumic and midrashic interpretation attached to the text of Gen 28:10-22, a great deal is made of the stone.<sup>28</sup> The underlying presence of this theme in the Jacob story, the story on which Luke builds the present scene, is potentially sufficiently strong to carry the interpretation of the name Cleopas as a signal that Cephas/Peter is intended.

Luke is not the only Gospel writer to draw on the traditions surrounding the Genesis account of Jacob's dream at Bethel. They were traditions which were very much alive during the time of Jesus and the early Church, as witnessed by the resonances of the same story in the Gospel of John.<sup>29</sup> However, whereas Luke uses the parallels as a setting for his account of the end of Jesus' earthly ministry, John does so for his account of the beginning of Jesus' ministry (1:35-51). In considering

---

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Rius-Camps, Comentari, vol I, on Acts 1:26.

<sup>28</sup> See Ginzberg, The Legends of the Jews, vol I, 349-54; Kugel, In Potiphar's House, 112-20; 'The Ladder of Jacob', HTR 88 (1995) 209-27; Massonnet, 'Targum, Midrash et Nouveau Testament'. There is another aspect of the 'stone' motif connected with the sons of Jacob, for the twelve patriarchs are represented on the priestly breastplate by twelve precious stones. This is an aspect which receives extensive treatment in early Jewish exegetical writings and whose importance should not be overlooked in considering similarities between Peter and the stone of Jacob: see Kugel, In Potiphar's House, 106-8.

<sup>29</sup> See Massonnet, 'Targum, Midrash et Nouveau Testament', 91-100.

the identity of Cleopas, it is worth noting that it is also within the context of the Jacob reference that John places the change of Simon's name to Cephas.<sup>30</sup>

## VIII. CONCLUSIONS

We have now considered the passage of Luke 24:12-35 from several angles: the name of the village for which the disciples were heading; their understanding of the recent events and the change that takes place through their encounter with Jesus; the significance of the story of Jacob at Bethel, as it was told in the Hebrew Bible and as it developed in Jewish tradition; the link between the last chapter of Luke's Gospel and the first chapter of the book of Acts; and the identity of the disciple called Cleopas. Overall, it can be seen in both the Bezan and the Alexandrian texts that the readings work together to form two different versions of the story, each with its own inner coherence. When the readings of the Bezan text are viewed from within the Jewish perspective that they reflect, they are seen to communicate a message which is essentially theological. The author of the Bezan text relies on the metaphorical meaning of his language, especially of names, to convey his message. He uses a meeting between Jesus and two of his disciples as a basis for a metaphorical expression of a spiritual reality. The purpose of the AT is, in contrast, primarily historical and the author uses language in a more literal way to tell the story as a factual account. The Jewish context of the participants in the encounter is not immediately apparent in the AT. Possibly a 'Jewish background' to the episode can be deduced, but the implied hearer or reader of the story is not addressed from within an insider's Jewish perspective.

We believe that the evidence that Codex Bezae reflects a Jewish point of view points, in turn, to an early date for its writing, a time when the events concerning Jesus and his followers were still considered as part of the on-going story of the Jews

---

<sup>30</sup> The story of Jacob's dream likewise appears to be alluded to in the text of Mark 16.3 in the Old Latin MS k, where mention is made of angels moving up and down between heaven and earth at the point when the stone is moved from the tomb of Jesus.

as the People of God, rather than as the beginning of a new and separate religion and community. Taking account of this context of Judaism, we have suggested possible reasons why the Bezan text may have been altered. A later generation of Christians, who were no longer as conscious of their origins in Judaism as were the first generations, may simply not have recognized many of the reminiscences of traditional stories and teachings. As a consequence of this, they could have chosen to convert specific references such as 'Oulammaous' to entities which were more readily recognizable, and to alter the subtle, theological message to one more readily accessible. On the other hand, the reference to Oulammaous with its connotations may have been only too well recognized as a key to the fact that the underlying encounter at Bethel was a model for Luke's story. For that reason, the allusions to the history of Israel, and to the Torah as the divinely created model for that history, may have been eliminated because they proved offensive to Christian believers who by now saw themselves as quite distinct from the Jews.

Such an account of the history of the manuscript divergences matches what is known of the history of the early years of the Church, a period of gradual separation between Jews and Christians. Codex Bezae, as a manuscript that has retained a Jewish perspective, thus stands as a primary witness to the earliest years of Christianity.